

### **INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

Applicants thank Examiners Ingvaldstad and Beliveau for the courtesy extended during a telephone interview on November 18, 2010. Inventor, Terry Potter and Mr. Robert Scanlan of the assignee joined counsel, Robert Asher on the telephone call.

The discussion reviewed claim 97 and applicants' counsel explained that Aviv was inapplicable to a storage, search and retrieval system. Aviv related to taking video with a camera and speeding up or slowing down the sampling rate in response to detection of suspicious activity. While recognizing the differences, the examiners argued that the claim language did not specify what was being searched. Consensus was reached that the claims could overcome the cited art by specifying that it was the response data stored in the associative mapping that was being searched to generate the summary video.

The invention of claims 70 and 80 were discussed and contrasted with Rector. Dr. Potter explained the significant differences especially in terms of time between searching an associative mapping and conducting a search through a continuous or flat file, such as the IFFPHYS format. Dr. Potter also described the advantages an associative memory offers by allowing searching and writing to occur at the same time. For Rector, on the other hand, its continuous file cannot be read from and written to at the same time. Despite the significant differences, the examiners insisted that Rector could be described as a table having rows that could be searched to retrieve a video frame responsive to the search. The term associative mapping was not interpreted to preclude searching through an entire file in order to locate data along a row of the mapping. The examiners recommended that applicants amend the claims to be more specific about the distinguishing characteristics of an associative mapping.